

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,701	03/29/2004	Takeo Ohsaka	Q80771	9046
65565 SUGHRUE-26	7590 07/10/200 55550	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVE. NW		JOYNER, KEVIN	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037-3213		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/810,701	OHSAKA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KEVIN C. JOYNER	1797		

	KEVIN C. JOYNER	1797						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 01 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.						
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(n).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be	filed within two month	of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 								
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL 004)					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
	 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the 							
 To repurposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the company. 		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	nada bolow or appoinada.							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
NECOUST FOR RECONSIDERATION THEN 1. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								
	/Sean E Conley/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the health and safety concerns limit the direct application of peracids generated by the Lokkesome process for "medical sterilization, food processing and consumer product applications." In other words, Tennakoon teaches away from using a particulate solid acid catalyst for the sterilization of drink containers and medical devices. However, the Examiner contends that the particular catalyst layer utilized by Lokkesmoe causes the swelling, which creates the need for the chelating agents and the degradation. As such, the twoic products cettle that create the safety concerns are specifically related to that particular catalyst layer. Tennakoon specifically discloses a different solid acid catalyst that will not product in column 4, lines 42-47 and column 7, lines 25-39. Therefore, Tennakoon does not teach against utilizing a particulate solid acid catalyst for the sterilization of drink containers and medical devices.

The Applicant continues to argue that modifying Merk such that it includes a particulate solid acid catalyst comprising a polymer resin filling space between the gas cathode and the membrane with the anode in contact with the membrane would alter the configuration to an apparatus of a single chamber. Further, Merk discloses that no membrane is needed in such a single chamber configuration and therefore one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to make such a combination. However, the Examiner contends that such an alteration of Merk would not result in a single chamber configuration, wherein Tennakoon clearly discloses a two chamber configuration that includes a solid acid catalyst filing a space between a gas cathode and a membrane with an anode that is in contact with said membrane. As such, one of ordinary skill would be motivated to modify the electrotytic cell of Merk to include the particular configuration frankson comprising the solid catalyst filling a space between the gas cathode and the membrane with an anode in contact with said membrane in order to increase production rates of the aqueous solution.

/Sean E Conley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797